

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**October 17, 2001**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Minutes**

---

**Attendees:**

Bresler, Helen	DOE
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Hersh, Mark	EPA
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Johnson, Ron	DNR Contracts Specialist
Lindley, Deborah	DNR
Lippke, Bruce	University of Washington, College of Forest Resources
MarCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, CMER Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
Parks, Dave	DNR
Pederson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Sugamish Tribe
Quinn, Tim	CMER Co-Chair
Raines, Mary	NWIFC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-hames, Dave	NWIFC
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR
Wundelich, Bob	USFWS

---

Mary Raines submitted a correction to the minutes from last month. Corrected language is as follows:

“UPSAG anticipates that the TFW 118 report “Comparison of the GIS-based Models of Shallow Landsliding for Application to Watershed Management” will be ready for scientific review within the next month.”

Geoff McNaughton introduced Ron Johnson who is the new contracts specialist for CMER. Ron has a long history with DNR and has a great deal of contracts management experience. He was warmly welcomed. If you need to Call Ron, you can reach him at 902-1564 or [ron.johnson@wadnr.gov](mailto:ron.johnson@wadnr.gov).

Nancy Sturhan is back from a prolonged absence and she will be representing the DNR Forest Practices Division. A warm welcome back was extended to Sturhan as well.

---

**SRC Update and Science Review Process:** Geoff McNaughton said that the contract for the SRC has been signed. Projects will be submitted within weeks.

Martin said that we have talked briefly about the types of items that SAGS should submit. McNaughton said that we need further discussion on this topic. Steve McConnell said that RSAG would like to draw up a contract for the Hardwood Conversion study and then have it reviewed by the SRC. RFPs were not among the items that CMER had originally proposed for review by the SRC.

Study designs and final study results were the two items discussed for review by the SRC. The Review committee is paid \$300 for looking at a study design and \$700 to look at a final report. Intermediate products may also be reviewed, but CMER should be aware that the price for review would increase accordingly.

Designs and final reports are key to the review process and they are the most important. McNaughton said that the intermediate work products are not in the contract with a specified cost at this time. The group agreed that the Hardwood Conversion RFP is actually a study design and would qualify for review under the current contract with the SRC which specifies only study designs and final reports as items for review.

Martin said we also need to put things in context for the SRC when we send things to them for review. There must be a set of specific questions for them to address. Quinn said that an oversight committee (contact list) would also be needed to talk with the SRC. When a document is submitted to the SRC the following three items must be forward as well: a specific question list, a contact list, and a context of the study. McNaughton will review submittals for a while to ensure that we are putting forth the right information. Four copies of each submittal must be provided to the University.

---

**Lists of Projects to be reviewed:** UPSAG is submitting no new requests. However, the TFW 118 final draft (test of GIS slope stability models as a screening tool for the westside) previously approved for SRC review by CMER will be submitted in the next week or two. DNR has acquired funding for a project that will be coordinated through UPSAG to do this same type of project for the eastside of the state. If they can get the first part of this project through scientific review (TFW 118), it would inform the eastside project. Raines raised questions about the submittal process and what order would be best. Quinn said that UPSAG should work on this matter and then forward a recommendation to CMER.

RSAG said that hardwood conversion is still several months away and they have no additional requests.

WETSAG has no requests at this time, but wetland regeneration will be coming out next year.

LWAG has no new requests.

SAGE has no new requests. They are working on a pre-fire review of what is on the landscape now will not need scientific review of that project.

BTSAG has no new requests. After January, they may need the solar radiation study design reviewed. Also, the Groundwater project may have some experimental designs and hypotheses to explore.

ISAG has no new requests.

---

**CMER 2002 Budget Review and Project Approval:** McNaughton has worked on getting corrected budget figures for CMER and he distributed those this morning (spreadsheet available from DNR). There is \$70,000 carryover from last year. The other substantial budget item that is different from Grizzel's earlier version is the overhead charge on the state funds. The overhead rate will not be a straight 23.2% as previously thought, but will instead be based on the number of FTE's (staff) charging to that program. Currently, the rate is \$46,000 per FTE per bienium. With 2 FTE's (Administrator and Contract Specialist), the overhead charge will be \$46,000 per year. However, this is still under discussion and may change. To carry out all of the proposed studies would involve an additional \$326,000. Bull trout funding has been removed and project prioritization in September has been added. Projects that are not funded at this time include: densiometer protocol development, ponderosa pine birds, wetland regeneration study, eastside snags, western grey squirrel and University of Kentucky Bats.

Jackson asked about the two bull trout projects that remain on the list and McNaughton indicated that those projects involve interagency agreements so they should remain on the list. There was discussion about

whether to include bull trout projects on this budget sheet or to list them separately. A small group involving Terry Jackson, Craig Hansen, Bob Wunderlich (assigned by the USFWS to track the bull trout research monies) and Geoff McNaughton will meet to discuss the best way to represent these monies and will report back to CMER in November.

Hansen added that the USFWS will have carryover monies for the next year that can be used to help other CMER projects move along. They need to spend \$228,000 by December 15 or it will go to the Department of Defense. SAGs with projects that may qualify for this funding are encouraged to submit those projects to Terry Jackson ASAP. BTSAG meets on November 5 and can make decisions then. Also, any projects considered for funding must be close to or under contract already because there is no time to get a procurement document in place prior to the December 15 deadline.. Martin suggested that the watertyping project may qualify for these monies and if the \$165,000 that the state is spending on that project can be alleviated, the rest of the CMER projects being proposed could be funded.

Sturhan added a concern that all state agencies are being asked to cut 15%. CMER state money is subject to that request. McNaughton said that DNR has had a great deal of discussion and they will not be making across the board cuts. Forest Practices may remain in tact with this scenario.

Two other corrections to the budget sheet were suggested: Pleus suggested a change in NWIFC staff to CMER staff and that the \$14K carryover be deleted from the sheet. Mark Hunter said that the Fish Passage study is actually an ISAG project and that should be corrected.

---

**New Projects:** Raines said that she has looked at the UPSAG projects and wondered if some of their funding could come from other sources, such as like project development. The road program/RMAP effectiveness project budget projections are incorrectly listed under the new "Road Program" budget requests and appears in the unfunded section of the budget sheet. Those budget projections should be moved up to the Road Program/RMAP effectiveness line. The \$375,000 allocated to it will move up as well.

---

**Substantial changes to 2002 estimates:** Hunter said that the RSAG projects still are seeking a go ahead to spend their money. Quinn said that the money has been approved for sometime now. Hunter said that RSAG will need to work quickly to spend their dollars.

There was a long discussion regarding the Eastside Nomograph project. This project has fallen off the budget sheet and SAGE was planning to complete it with monies previously allocated. The project has been moved through three different SAGs since its inception and was subsequently dropped from the budget inadvertently. CMER participants agreed that the project qualifies for funding and should appear in its original prioritization location.

CMER participants agreed that all projects on the list will be forwarded to the Policy Committee with a recommendation for approval. This recommendation will have the caveat that some projects do not have funding at this time. They will be funded and moved forward in the order that they appear on the list.

Questions to be considered at a future meeting include out-year funding and how to prioritize projects over the long term.

Adjourned for lunch, reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

---

**Assignment to SAGS:** Quinn said that short descriptions of the projects are needed for the policy committee to review as they look recommendations. Please include the L-2 reference and a brief description of the study. McNaughton indicated that the SAGs have already forwarded their priorities with

summaries to him for the budget. SAGs should review this list for completeness and accuracy and get any changes to McNaughton by October 26<sup>th</sup>, 5:00 p.m.

---

**Application of CMER Results:**

Raines introduced Bob Palmquist who is the new CMER staff with NWIFC. He is a geomorphologist and will report to Dave Schuett-Hames. He was warmly welcomed.

At the last meeting we considered and discussed a way to facilitate the CMER/policy relationship. We talked about getting the stakeholders together to do that and Hunter took the lead on this assignment. This same request was submitted to the Forests and Fish Policy Committee where it was supported. McNaughton indicated that some concerns have been brought to him. For instance, the question of whether we are adding another layer to the bureaucracy, what the purpose of the Adaptive Management Oversight Committee is and does this kind of facilitation fall under their preview.

Quinn provided additional background: The policy group cannot relate with CMER on scientific issues, their role is to create policy. Therefore, an interface is needed and the stakeholders are a group of people who are able to provide the interface. They could be very helpful to the policy. Though McNaughton should not do this task alone, he should certainly serve in the lead role.

If we wait until we get results of studies to bring them to policy, we will fail. We need to keep them informed as we go along. We need to answer for policy what the management implications are, the purpose of the study, the design behind it, etc.

This kind of group would provide the following:

- The language/intention of FFR as related to the study (why conduct the study, what might the implications be)
- Explain briefly the study design
- Note clearly what the management implications might be
- Remind them of this at the end
- Explain results and implications

McNaughton has scheduled a meeting of the stakeholder group on November 6 and they will talk about how to move forward with this. They will identify problems and develop recommendations about how we should move forward.

---

**SAG Updates and Discussions:**

WETSAG: This committee is working on a wetland regeneration draft.

UPSAG: Pleus said that the Type N group has wrapped up their data collection season. They collected about 300 points of data and they are working on a to do list with a draft RFP for someone to analyze the data. Palmquist added that they talked about basin size, which ranges from two acres to thousands of acres.

ISAG: Cramer said that the watertyping model has hit some obstacles. Their observed data set has errors and they needed to pull back from the contractor. They have been set back by several months. They are working on preliminary rules to help them get to a point where they can look at models. The model will be completed in late 02 or early 03 for the westside. The eastside is not delayed at this time. The larger issue is that DNR has hit obstacles with the hydro layer. They are going to a new model to manage the hydro layer

which is not run elsewhere, so there are some obstacles to overcome. All work on the hydroconversion project has now stopped because of these problems. This has the potential to delay the process by another year. However, ISAG is only delayed by a few months. The new stream types cannot be coded to the database until the GIS system is in place for the hydrolayer.

RSAG: Hunter said that they are moving forward with the DFC. There were no substantial comments on the pilot study report. Schuett-hames is scoping sights and they are working to contract the temperature cruising aspects. The temperature workshop proceedings are almost final but they are still incorporating a few additional comments. CMER will consider these proceedings for approval when all comments have been incorporated. Eric Beach was contracted by the UW to provide a prospectus as to how the growth and yield program would work. He has agreed to share this with RSAG by early October, but this has not occurred yet.

The hardwood conversion RFP went out for review to CMER, one SAG committee has requested that additional data gathering efforts occur within the project. A workgroup has been set up to consider this request and how it would work. The study must get moving or they will not be able to get fieldwork done next summer. Hunter would like CMER to place a one-month limit on comments. CMER agreed that comments are due one week before the next CMER meeting and this RFP will be considered for final approval in November. The DFC pilot study has been out for comment and finalized by RSAG. Hunter is seeking CMER approval today. CMER approved the pilot study as final.

LWAG: MacCracken said that they are getting proposals on the RMZ study today. A committee will review the proposals and send the top two to the SRC. The annual report is in and under review for the sampling study.

BTSAG: Jackson said that they have nothing new to report.

SAGE: Pederson said that they met last Monday and the literature search RFP has been delivered to McNaughton. They have worked out a scope of work on that project so that they have a picture of what is available prior to the fires. That will be out for review shortly. The Eastside nomograph was worked on a little bit and put into subcommittee. They will be immediately in touch with Terry Jackson to get this funded through the BTSAG and it should be out for review within a month. Schuett-hames can devote some time to the effort but not full time. He will be attending the next SAGE meeting and can then be able to give feedback about what he can provide.

McNaughton said that the work plan group will meet soon.

Pucci suggested that we need to discuss the checks and balances system used for projects. As they change, they may require reprioritization. This will be placed on a future agenda.

---

#### **Agenda for November:**

Process for setting the agenda and getting background information to people in advance (workplan discussion)

Policy update from either McNaughton or Tim Quinn

\*Update of development of communication link between CMER and policy (if AMOC co-chairs are coming)

Update on the USFWS distribution of funds

Update on the state budget situation if available

\*Bull Trout SAG recommendation for funding expenses

\*Hardwood conversion RFP approval

\*Stream temperature workshop proceedings approval

Co-chairs of AMOC Presentation (McNaughton will invite them)

Review budgets and see how closely they fit the expectations on the spreadsheet

Proposal for group skill building (Heather Rowton and Mary Raines)

\* indicates action item

The next CMER meeting is scheduled for November 20<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m., location to be arranged